

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-31003-2016

Date of Decision:- 23.11.2016

Dinesh Gugnani and another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

**Present: Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioners.**

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG, Haryana.

**Mr. N.K. Malhotra, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.**

RITU BAHRI, J. (Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.107 dated 11.04.2014, under Sections 377 (deleted), 406, 323, 498-A and 506 read with Section 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Shivaji Colony, Rohtak, on the basis of compromise dated 29.07.2016 (Annexure P-2).

Brief facts of the case are that marriage of complainant was solemnized with petitioner No.1 Dinesh Gugnani on 19.11.2012 according to Hindu Rites and Rituals. The parents of the complainant had given dowry according to their capacity. After the marriage, the behavior of the accused became changed and they started beatings to the complainant on account of demand of dowry. Due to incompatibility of temperament, both the parties could not live together as husband and wife. The relationship between them became strained and thereafter, the F.I.R was registered against the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that keeping in view the peace and harmony, the matter has now been amicably settled between the parties with the intervention of respectable persons, vide compromise dated 29.07.2016 (Annexure P-2).

During the course of preliminary hearing, the trial Court, was directed to record the statements of all the concerned parties, with regard to the genuineness and validity or otherwise of the compromise dated 29.07.2016 (Annexure P-2), by way of order dated 05.09.2016, by this Court.

In compliance of order dated 05.09.2016 of this Court, the report of the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Rohtak dated 21.10.2016 has been received. As per the report, the statements of all the concerned parties have been recorded and the complainant has no objection, if the present FIR registered against the petitioners is quashed. Statements of the accused and complainant have been recorded to the same effect.

Consequently, in view of the above-said report and in view of the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Dr. Arvind Barsaul etc. Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh and another, 2008(2) RCR (Criminal) 910; Madan Mohan Abbot vs. State of Punjab, 2008(2) RCR (Criminal) 429** and the law laid down by the Full Bench of this Court in the case of **Kulwinder Singh and Ors. vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Crl.) 1052**, no useful purpose would be served in prolonging the litigation.

Accordingly, FIR No.107 dated 11.04.2014, under Sections 377 (deleted), 406, 323, 498-A and 506 read with Section 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Shivaji Colony, Rohtak and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed, on the basis of compromise dated 29.07.2016 (Annexure P-2).

The present petition stands disposed of.

November 23, 2016
naresh.k

(**RITU BAHRI**)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No